



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,503	0	9/22/2004	PEI-HAW TSAO	TSMC 2003-1622	5502
44045	7590	590 11/02/2006		EXAMINER	
BAKER &			FARAHANI, DANA		
ON BEHAL		C OW CENTER	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
2001 ROSS	AVENUE,	SUITE 2300	2891		
DALLAS, 7	ΓX 75201			DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/711,503	TSAO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Dana Farahani	. 2891				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOR tute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13	<u> September 2006</u> .					
, <u>—</u>	,—					
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	·	•				
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex paπe Quayle</i> , 1935 С.L	J. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>16-26</u> is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>16-26</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	lrawn from consideration.	·				
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2004 Applicant may not request that any objection to to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)[he drawing(s) be held in abeya rection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1 Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a light	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No I received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	o □	Summer (DTO 442)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date informal Patent Application				

Application/Control Number: 10/711,503

Art Unit: 2891

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 16-18 and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Koike et al. hereinafter Koike (US Paten Application Publication 2004/0036164).

Regarding claims 16 and 26, Koike discloses in figure 10 a semiconductor package device, comprising:

a package substrate 2 having a first coefficient of thermal expansion and at least one bonding pad 6 on a surface of the package substrate; and

an integrated circuit chip 3 formed from a semiconductor wafer, the chip comprising: electrical devices formed therein (inherently in the chip),

at least one coupling structure 11 for bonding the chip to the at least one bonding pad on the package substrate; and

a final thickness less than a thickness of the semiconductor wafer (see paragraph 49), wherein the final thickness allows the chip to distort substantially with the package substrate during temperature changes despite the mismatch in their respective coefficients of thermal expansion (see also paragraph 65). A shape of the chip substantially conforms to a shape of the package substrate. See paragraph 74, wherein the chip and the substrate are cured together for

Application/Control Number: 10/711,503

Art Unit: 2891

the purpose of curing the resin in between them. Since if the shape of the chip would have not substantially conform to the shape of the substrate during this temperature change, the chip would crack and become defective, it follows that the chip in fact conforms the shape of the substrate at least to some small degree, so the chip and a result the device would not become defective.

Although, Koike does not expressly disclose a second coefficient of thermal expansion different than the first coefficient of thermal expansion, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the substrate from different material (i.e. different thermal expansion) than that of the chip for cost purposes.

Regarding claims 17 and 18, Koike discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the numerical amount of the thickness of the chip. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the chip with a desired thickness in accordance to how much pressure the chip would be handling during and after the fabrication of the chip. See *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980) for the proposition that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 20-22, the coupling structure 11 is a lead free solder metal (Au); see paragraph 64.

Regarding claims 23 and 24, a dielectric encapsulant 12 is adjacent to a surface of the chip that is closest to the package substrate, and the one coupling structure is adjacent to the encapsulant.

Regarding claim 25, Koike discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the substrate is the material recited in the claim. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select the material of the substrate from the materials recited in claim 25, in accordance to one of ordinary skill in the art preference of the material and cost considerations. See *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ, for the proposition that it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a material on the basis of its suitability for an application. Note that substrate 2 has conductive traces therein (9 of figure 9).

3. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koike as applied to claim16 above, and further in view of Huang (US Patent 6,559,525).

Koike discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for a heat spreader coupled to the surface of the chip free of electrical devices.

Huang discloses in figure 7, heat sink 370 coupled to a surface of the chip 330.

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to attach a heat sink to a surface of the chip of the Koike reference in order to dissipate heat which would be generated during the chip functioning.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments filed 9/13/06 have been fully considered and are believed as being addressed in the above rejections.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dana Farahani whose telephone number is (571)272-1706. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM - 5:00PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/711,503 Page 5

Art Unit: 2891

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Baumeister can be reached on (571)272-1722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DF

B. WILLIAM BAUMEISTER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED